



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/578,895	05/26/00	YAMAZAKI	S 0756-2160

022204
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
8180 GREENSBORO DRIVE
SUITE 800
MCLEAN VA 22102

MMC2/0730

EXAMINER

MUNSON, G

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED:

07/30/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

578,893

Applicant(s)

S. YAMAZAKI ET AL

Examiner

G. MUNSON

Group Art Unit

2811

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 1 1; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1 7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 3
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 2811

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In claims 1-3 and 8-10 acronyms such as "TFT", "EL" and "LDD" are ambiguous for a claim; it is suggested to use "thin film transistor (TFT)" and "electroluminescence (EL)" and "lightly doped drain (LDD)" at the first instance for clarity, if that is the scope intended. For claims 11-16, it is unclear how the claims further limit the electro-optical device of claims 1-3. This rejection could be overcome if each of claims 11-16 were put in independent form including the limitations of claims 1-3 on which they are dependent.

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. The listed "electronic" devices are not clearly described to enable a person skilled in the art to make and use the devices. Figures 16 and 20 may be sufficient for a design patent but not for a utility patent.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Tang et al '365, cited by applicants. The "channel forming" regions read on inherent subportions of a channel in TFT1 of Tang et al (Figure 2).

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as unpatentable as shown by Hosokawa Japanese document 10-189252, cited by applicants. The "channel forming" regions read on inherent subportions of a channel in transistor 21 of Hosokawa (Figures 2, 3).

Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as unpatentable over Tang et al '365 and Hosokawa Japan document 10-189252, considered together. It would have been obvious to use pixels as in Tang et al (Figure 2) and Hosokawa (Figures 2, 3) in order to achieve flat panel displays for known electronic devices as claimed.

Art Unit: 2811

Xu et al, Shimada et al, Okita and Adan are cited of interest. Xu et al shows use of a pixel for a display. The other references show use of thin film transistors with two gates.

No claim is allowed. However, claim 3 appears directed towards allowable subject matter if the indefiniteness could be clarified.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to G. Munson at telephone number (703) 308-4925 or 0956.

Munson/nt

7/23/01



GENE M. MUNSON
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 2831